DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 953 PS 006 595

TITLE	Day Care Survey 1970-71.
INSTITUTION	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Westat Research, Inc., Rockville, Md.; Westinghouse Learning Corp., Bladensburg, Md.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. Office of Program Development.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., 1401 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Child Care Bulletin No. 7, $1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bulletins; *Child Care; *Child Care Centers; Costs; Data Collection; *Day Care Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Facility Case Studies; *Family Environment; Government Role; Mother Attitudes; Surveys; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS	Rowe (Mary P)

ABSTRACT

The survey and basic analysis presented in this bulletin characterize existing day care programs and facilities, and provide baseline descriptive data on the utilization of an expressed need for day care by low- and moderate-income families. Information was gathered from operators of day care centers and family day care homes, superintendents of school districts, mothers of children enrolled in the centers whose operators were interviewed, and mothers in families with annual incomes less than $8,000 and a child age 9 or under. The survey was not an evaluation of current day care arrangements. Major findings of the study showed that 55% of all children in day care full-day are cared for in family day care homes; less than 2% of the estimated 450,000 homes are licensed as compared with 90% of day care centers; an estimated 17,500 centers provide full-day care; most directors and teachers in the centers do not have college degrees and few have had special training; the largest age group in centers is the 4-year-old group; the types of day care centers are custodial, educational, and developmental; and estimated 63,000 unfilled day care slots existed; median family income was $7,500; median cost per month in centers runs from $27 to $114; and most working mothers in the population were satisfied with present child care arrangements. An appendix provides the testimony of Mary P. Rowe before the Senate Finance Committee on the needs, hopes, and costs of child care in America. (DB)

ED 078953

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PS 006595

CHILD CARE BULLETIN NO. 7

day care survey 1970–71

including an appendix:

the testimony of mary p. rowe before the senate finance committee.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Prepared for:
The Office of Economic Opportunity
(B00-5160)

by

Westinghouse Learning Corporation
and
Westat Research, Inc.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright
The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
Washington, D.C., 1971

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHILD CARE BULLETIN SERIES

Today, there is no longer a lack of materials on Day Care and Child Development. On the contrary, there is an impressive amount of materials now in print. Unfortunately, these publications are often inaccessible, or when they are available, they are frequently voluminous. Research and information retrieval then becomes an onerous task. There is absolutely no need to burden people who are involved in child care with difficulties of procuring inaccessible materials or with materials of unmanageable proportions.

There is a need for concise, readily available materials. These Bulletins are a response to that need. They synopsize a portion of the child care resources presently being developed and disseminated by the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., under Office of Economic Opportunity Grant No. C.G. 3614.

Each Bulletin, though developed independently, is closely interrelated with the others, by means of cross-references found in the text. The references to other Bulletins are provided with the intent of minimizing the built-in bias that is present in any study. We hope that this method will provide the reader with a truer perspective of current critical issues.

For the discriminating reader who requires more specific information, the complete, original publication from which this Bulletin was gleaned may be consulted in any of the following repositories:

- The fifty State Libraries
- The fifty State Offices of Economic Opportunity
- The ten Federal Regional Committee Headquarters
- The Library of Congress
- and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Library.

The perspectives and conclusions found in this Bulletin do not necessarily represent the policies of either the Office of Economic Opportunity/Office of Program Development or the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.

We wish to express our gratitude to the Council Board's Advisory Committee, Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, Dr. Leonard Mestas, and Mrs. Gwen Morgan, for their guidance and review in the preparation of these bulletins.

THE EDITORS
November, 1971

BOARD COMMITTEE PREFACE TO WESTINGHOUSE SURVEY BULLETIN

The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. acknowledges that it is a steward of federal funds charged with the responsibility of disseminating the findings of federally funded day care research. It affirms the public's right of access to information for which the public has paid. However, it also recognizes a responsibility to focus public attention on critical, perhaps controversial questions provoked by some of the research which it has agreed to distribute. Day Care Survey-1970, by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research, Inc., raises such questions.

As the Materials Development and Dissemination Project Advisory Committee of the Council's Board of Directors, we direct the reader's attention to the following questions and to their implications:

1. The Survey reports average monthly costs of $27 per child in a Type A (custodial) center, $45 in a Type B (educational) center, and $114 in a Type C (comprehensive) Center. Questions of methodology, such as the inconsistency of reporting and computing in-kind resources, the questionable validity of computing two part-day children as a full time equivalent, and the hidden costs in proprietary center operation, suggest that these averages may be as much as 50% low. To build day care planning on this statistical framework, circumventing the difficult issues of quality, may be a gross underestimation of the resources necessary to care adequately for our children.

2. The survey concludes that " ... most working mothers whose children are in centers seem to be satisfied with group care for their children: a majority of them want no change in their day care ..." Such a conclusion is not surprising in light of the lack of options available to a majority of working mothers. Indeed, it would be startling if any other result had been measured given normal parental defensiveness of choice which is in fact no choice at all. When a real variety of options is available to working and nonworking mothers, then and only then can valid conclusions be drawn about what type and quality of care they actually want for their children. The survey has only measured the predictable fact that parents defend choices which they have made.

3. Despite the fact that the survey forswears consideration of quality issues, its typology (custodial, educational, and comprehensive) will lead to confusion, especially when cost figures are matched with these three types. Costs and quality, measured in terms of what kind of care and developmental experiences children receive, do not stand in a one to one correlation. A more valid correlation exists between costs and staff-child ratios. All three types of day care are costly if there are enough staff to provide adequate attention to the needs of the children in care. Use of terms such as custodial, educational, and comprehensive implies evaluations relative to costs which are not borne out by the analysis.

We are concerned that the issue of quality day care be faced squarely insofar as planning for expanded services is concerned, and we must raise questions about the usefulness of research findings which fail to consider, or tend to confuse this issue. The following pages

present the Survey's "Overview," summarizing its findings. Our staff has provided the indented references to other sources of information which you will find in the text. With the concurrence of OEO/OPD, we have included, as an appendix, the complete text of Mary Rowe's testimony before the Senate Finance Committee (September, 1971), which we believe to be a more valid consideration of cost issues of day care than that contained in the Survey.

Th Grant Advisory Committee,
Day Care and Child Development Council of America
Board of Directors:

Leonard J. Mestas, Chrm.
Mrs. Gwen Morgan
Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling

OVERVIEW: PERSPECTIVE ON DAY CARE NATIONWIDE

DEFINITIONS

Some general terms have been given specific definitions for this study. In order to assist the reader, these definitions are listed below.

Day Care -- The care and protection of infants, preschool, and school-age children outside of their own homes during a portion of a 24-hour day

Day Care center--facility providing care for groups of seven or more children.

Family day Care home--home in which no more than six children are cared for, for compensation

Proprietary--operated for profit

User Sample--the parents, most often the mothers, of children enrolled in the centers surveyed. (This sample covered parents who use day care centers, regardless of income.)

Area Sample--general population survey of the target population. (Families with annual incomes of less than $8,000 and at least one child are 9 or under.)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Basis for This Survey

Demands for child care programs are growing. They come from mothers who must work to support their families, from women on welfare who want to better their lives and, increasingly, from middle class mothers who want to escape the confines of their traditionally home-bound roles. All indications point toward an increasing need for adequate day care nationally over the next few years.

Nearly one-third of the nation's mothers of preschool children who live with their husbands are already in the workforce. Between 1965 and 1970 the number of these mothers with children between 3 and 5 years has risen 8 percent.[1] Some presently nonworking mothers would seek employment in order to balance the family budget or to get off welfare if suitable child care services were available at prices they could afford. The Women's Bureau reports that the total number of working mothers (including single women supporting children on their own) has more than doubled since 1950. Projections for 1980 suggest that there will be at least 5.3 million mothers in the workforce with children under 5, a 43 percent increase between 1970 and 1980.[2] Thus social and economic currents are giving a new emphasis to day care and this emphasis is reflected in a variety of proposed federal legislation.

Latest statistics available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Department of Labor project that by 1985 there will be 6.6 million mothers between the ages of twenty and forty-four with children under five years of age.

In the quest for more effective and comprehensive day care and child development programs, proponents have suggested a two-pronged attack. First, there is a growing belief that some form of early childhood intervention which would provide structured growth experiences can have a beneficial effect on a child's development. Such intervention seems to be especially helpful to the disadvantaged child. Secondly, there is a belief that day care programs can free many low-income mothers to take advantages of employment and training opportunities which would then raise the standard of living for their whole family.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (March, 1971) provides strong evidence that many low-income mothers are already working. Of all the working mothers with children under six, one-half are either widowed, divorced, separated, or wives of husbands making less than $7,000 per year.

Several bills have been introduced in the 92nd Congress which would foster the increase of child development and child care services. Although most of them would include children

1. *Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Manpower Information Service, Vol. 2, No. 12, Feb. 24, 1970, pg. 288.*

2. *Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Working Mothers and the Need For Child Care Services, May 1967.*

from all income levels in the proposed programs, a primary emphasis of the legislation is on helping the disadvantaged escape the cycle of poverty at an early age. Included in the administration's Family Assistance Plan (FAP) is the provision for various types of child care to enable mothers to undertake or continue manpower training or employment. Four other bills embody a comprehensive approach to child development, with the intention of providing the full range of child development services essential to the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of children. Two of these bills would consolidate all existing child care and development programs under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Another bill currently before Congress would appropriate money only for supplementary educational services and equipment for existing day care centers in order to provide educational and cultural enrichment for the children. The proposed legislation, together with the increasing demand for child care programs, confirms the need for a study such as this one.

Child Care Bulletin No. 5, Subject: Planning Papers and Evaluation of the Vermont Model Family Assistance Plan (Child Care Component), describes some initial plans for providing day care through welfare reform legislation.

B. Objectives on the Survey

This survey and basic analysis of existing day care programs and facilities is one of a series of studies being made for the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide current and reliable national reference data in areas of day care services for children and of closely related early childhood development topics. The goal of this particular project is to provide data for use by researchers and planners in programmatic areas where day care services for children are a significant component.

The survey and basic analysis presented here, carried out by Westat Research, Inc. under subcontract to Westinghouse Learning Corporation, characterizes existing day care programs and facilities and provides baseline descriptive data on the utilization of an expressed need for day care by low-and moderate-income families. Specifically, the survey was designed to provide the data which can be used to answer the following questions:

PS 006 526

What is the current availability of day care facilities nationwide?

What are the characteristics of these day care facilities in terms of physical plant, services offered, enrollment size, clientele, staff, finances, sponsors, and operators?

What are the costs of providing various levels of day care services?

What is the current need for day care services among low-and moderate-income families?

What are the preferences of day care users and potential users as to type of day care desired for their children?

How satisfied are working mothers with their present arrangements?

What is the relationship between day care availability and employment of mothers?

What are the costs of expanding day care?

To answer these questions, information was gathered from the following sources:

Operators of day care centers;

Operators of family day care homes;

Superintendents of school districts;

Mothers of children enrolled in the centers whose operators were interviewed; and

Mothers in families with annual incomes less than $8,000 and a child age 9 or under.

Individuals to be interviewed were identified through sampling procedures described in Section 1.1 and Appendix A of the report. The statistics presented here, except where otherwise noted, are projections based on these national probability samples of day care facilities, school districts, and households.

C. Limitations of the Survey

The intent of the survey and the subsequent survey design imposed limitations on this study which must be kept in mind when interpreting data. The survey was not intended to be an evaluation of current day care arrangements. No attempt was made to assess the quality of the range of services provided, and no judgments have been made as to the desirability of various types of child care programs.

It is also important to recognize that several distinct populations were surveyed and that the different sets of data collected often are not comparable with each other. The information collected about day care homes and centers and their clientele represent a cross-section of all day care facilities serving all economic levels. The general population survey, also known as the "Area Sample," was designed to obtain data on the arrangements for children of working mothers in households with incomes of $8,000 or less per year and with at least one child nine years of age or younger. Thus, information about parents and children collected from the day care facilities survey does not cover the same populations as the information on parents and children gathered from the area survey.

Finally, because of limitations on the amount of data which could be collected within the time frame of the field survey, no current child care arrangement details were obtained from nonworking mothers. These mothers were asked to state the kind of day care arrangements they would prefer if they went to work. They were also asked about their reasons for stopping work if they indicated that they had been employed at some previous time. No information, however, was collected on the work histories of now nonworking mothers.

Massachusetts Early Education Project (MEEP) survey (Cambridge, Mass., 1971) was able to obtain data on child care arrangements of nonworking mothers in that state.

D. Perspective on Organized Day Care

Perhaps the single striking fact about day care in this country today is that, despite the

manifest need, there is so little of it. The fact is that most of the children of working mothers are cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives. In 1965 there were over twelve million children under 14 years old whose mothers were working. Since the labor force participation of mothers has increased by 7 percent since 1965, we can assume that an even greater number of children have working mothers now.[3] Yet only about one and a half million of these children are in day care centers and homes, with slightly more than half of them in homes.

It is easy to forget, when reading this report, that a relatively small number (approximately 1.3 million) of the children under 14 of working mothers are represented in our statistics on day care centers and homes.

Apparently the reason for so little formal day care is not that parents do not want it and do not need it. By any indicators of need, the number of children who might be in organized day care is greater than the number that can be accommodated by existing facilities. Whether one looks at just the names on center waiting lists, or the children whose mothers are dissatisfied with their present informal arrangements, or the children whose mothers would like to work if acceptable child care were available, the numbers are significant. Furthermore, substantial numbers of working mothers in the area sample indicated that they would prefer a day care center over their present arrangement for their children; a similar percentage of nonworking mothers said that they would want care in a center if they went to work.

Why, then are there so few day care centers and licensed homes? The main problem is money. There has been little money for day care because mothers often are not paid enough to be able to afford day care, or they may be unwilling to pay for the most desirable kind of care; and society, more specificially the government, has assumed at best only token responsibility for this function. The prevailing attitude has been that child care is the mother's responsibility; and, if she goes to work, she must somehow see to it that her children are cared for. Under pressure from the increasing numbers of mothers entering the labor force, especially middle class mothers, this attitude is changing. Five to ten years ago, when the Women's Bureau and the Child Welfare League were studying day care arrangements of working mothers, the questions were: "Is there a need for more organized day care?" and, "Should the government support day care?" Now many are assuming that the government should help pay for day care and the questions are:

1) How much additional day care is needed?
2) How much does it cost?
3) What kind should be provided?
4) For whom should government provide day care?

This study provides some information for answering the first two questions about need and costs. The other questions are issues of policy that must be determined by the

3. *Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Manpower Information Service, Volume 2, No. 12 February 24, 1971, p. 288.*

government; however, much of the information collected in this study could be useful for making these decisions.

For a detailed analysis of day care supply and demand with a consideration of willingness to pay, see the written testimony of Mary P. Rowe, Economic Consultant for Abt Associates, Inc., in the Hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate on S. 2003, Child Care Provisions of H.R.1., and Title VI of the printed amendment 318 to H.R.1., Sept. 22-24, 1971. Mrs. Rowe's testimony, which will also appear as a chapter in Child Care in Massachusetts, 1971 (Abt Associates, in press), contains a critique of the methodology and conclusions of Day Care Survey 1970 (Westat). (See Appendix).

II. MAJOR FINDINGS

A. Family Day Care Homes

Because day care usually brings to mind child care provided in some sort of day care center, the category of family day care homes is often overlooked completely.[4] Certainly much less attention has been paid to the kind of care provided in such homes or to the appropriateness of perhaps expanding this type of day care service. Yet the majority (55%) of all children in day care full-day are cared for in family day care homes.

For further consideration of day care homes as a child care delivery system, see Child Care Bulletin No. 3, Subject: A Study in Day Care 1970-71 (Abt), especially the charts tabulating costs of care provided by Family Day Care Career Program in New York City.

More than half of the day care homes have white operators and are located in single family units situated in a residential, single family neighborhood. Three-fourths of the homes care for only one or two children on full-day basis. More than one-fifth of the children in such homes are under 2 years of age.

Probably the single most striking statistic on day care homes is that less than 2 percent of the estimated 450,000 homes are licensed as compared with almost 90 percent of the centers. Some states do not require licensing if there are fewer than a certain number of children (usually three) being cared for. Nevertheless, this very small percentage of licensed homes seems to bear out the findings of the community studies that complicated, contradictory and often overly detailed and rigid requirements discourage licensing.[5] Licensing agencies are often understaffed and have little opportunity to recruit day care mothers or to seek out homes which should be licensed.

Family day care homes, then, are generally unlicensed and unsupervised by any governmental or social agency. Hundreds of thousands of children, including those whose

4. *For this survey family day care homes are those which care for not more than seven children, with at least two days per week, for pay. This classification excludes foster homes providing 24-hour care.*

5. *Task Ib of this survey: Community Profiles.*

fees are paid by government funds, are cared for in these homes, about which very little is known. This survey is the first attempt to assess the extent and describe the characteristics of day care homes.

See Child Care Bulletin No. 4, Subject: A Survey of State Day Care Licensing Requirements, for a summary of the complexities of licensing.

B. Day Care Centers

About 575,000 children receive full-day care in day care centers. These centers are so heterogeneous that it is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize about their characteristics. Nevertheless, some of the more striking statistics give a profile of day care centers nationwide. An estimated 17,500 centers provide full-day care. Sixty percent of these centers are proprietary, and proprietary centers care for about half the children enrolled in centers. Among the various nonprofit organizations, churches provide the greatest number of facilities, about 18 percent of all centers, and United Fund agencies operate the oldest day care centers. Public schools operate day care centers for some 108,000 children, but they offer little in the way of "extended day" programs for the school-age children of working mothers. More than four times as many preschool as school-age children are in public school day care programs. Only 21,000 school-age children in about 350 schools are cared for after school or before and after school.

1. Facilities

Day care centers, for the most part, occupy houses, specially constructed buildings, and churches; and they are located in residential neighborhoods. They are not, as yet, located in or near the workplace, except for hospital-sponsored facilities for nurses' children. Although no such centers were identified by the national survey, several were found in the six communities visited; and the Women's Bureau has identified about 150 hospital-affiliated day care centers.[6] It is impossible to tell from this survey whether workplace facilities would have appeal for mothers.

The amount of equipment for child use varies greatly from center to center, but most centers have some or all of the following kinds of equipment and playthings: indoor muscle development equipment such as blocks and trucks; quiet play equipment such as puzzles, art supplies, housekeeping toys, musical toys and instruments; education materials such as workbooks; science equipment; audio visual equipments; cots and cribs; and outdoor play apparatus. The estimated replacement value of this child-related equipment, on the average is $55 per child. It should be understood that this figure does not include administrative and kitchen equipment and furniture, or maintenance equipment. At several large, well-equipped centers visited during the community studies task, the average total equipment cost per child was estimated at approximately $100.

2. Day Care Programs

Very little attempt was made in this survey to characterize the programs or activities carried out at the centers. It was felt that this kind of description could only be made on the basis of expert observation over time, an approach that was not part of the survey design.

6. *Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals, 1970.*

The interviewers were encouraged to comment on their impressions and observations of the centers they visited, however, and from their notes and the on-site observations of the community studies teams, some idea of fairly general practices can be developed. At least some attempt is made in many centers to teach children words, stories, songs, and skills such as managing their own clothes. Apparently most operators of day care centers believe that they should provide preschool education, although what this means and how it is carried out varies widely. In contrast, neither they nor the parents mentioned health services very frequently as a responsibility of day care centers.

See Child Care Bulletin No. 1, Subject: Day Care: Resources for Decisions (OEO), and No. 3, Subject: A Study in Day Care 1970-71 (Abt), for more detailed information on developmental programming.

3. Characteristics of Day Care Staff

The people working in day care centers nationwide are, for the most part, neither well-educated nor well-paid. Most directors and teachers do not have college degrees and very few have had special training for day care work, e.g., courses in early childhood development. The median reported salary for both directors and teachers is less than $360 a month. There is not a great deal of experience among those presently employed in day care centers. Nearly a fourth of all staff members had less than a year's experience in group child care, and 51 percent of all staff have been working in day care less than three years. Women comprise almost the entire staff; only about 6 percent (including administrators and maintenance personnel) are men. Contrary to expectation, few day care personnel are volunteers. Less than 4 percent of the staff are volunteers and only 1 percent of them work full-time. Little use is made of teachers' aides. Perhaps this fact is related to the low status of day care teachers, most of whom have the education and salary level more often associated with paraprofessional than professional positions.

See Child Care Bulletin No. 3, Subject: A Study in Day Care 1970-71 (Abt), for different data on volunteers in day care centers.

Estimates of average staff to child ratios nationwide are likely to be meaningless, partly because of the wide differences in individual center ratios and staffing patterns, and partly because of the great number of part-time personnel. Their schedules and number of working hours vary enormously, making any computation of their total contribution a complex process.

A Study in Child Care, 1970-71 (Abt), did deal with this "complex process" of staff-child ratios, including part-time personnel in its computation in such a way as to equalize and thus make comparable various centers' budgets. See Child Care Bulletin No. 3.

4. Clientele of Day Care Centers

Day Care centers serve children from infancy through school-age. The largest age group in centers is the 4-year-old group. An estimated 24,000 children under 2 years old are enrolled in centers. While over half of all centers offer care of school-age children, only about 87,000 school children receive before and/or after school care in centers.

Centers serve a proportionately greater number of black than white children since 36 percent of the children in centers are black, the percentage of blacks being larger than that

in the general population. As might be expected, black children tend to be in the large centers, which are more frequently nonproprietary and located in large metropolitan areas.

A large number of centers (38%) do not permit sick children to attend, which means that working mothers whose children are enrolled in these centers must stay home from work or make other arrangements when their children have colds or other minor illnesses. Working mothers need day care centers which are equipped to care for slightly sick children.

5. A Typology for Day Care Centers

In the course of the community studies, it was observed that day care centers seem to fall into three categories or types of facilities. It was found that the centers in the national sample could also be categorized by these types. This typology should not be confused with levels of quality. It is based on aims of the program and descriptive elements without regard to whether these aims are being met, how well the elements are functioning, or what effect they have on the children and families being served. Good and bad Type A centers and good and bad Type C centers can be found.

Type A centers aim to provide what is generally known as "custodial" care, that kind of care which is necessary for maintaining the physical well-being and safety of the child but without any systematic attempt to educate him. Good custodial centers approximate good home care. They have small child to staff ratios, variety and sufficient quantity of equipment and playthings, adequate space, safe environments, warm and child-loving adults, daily routines, nutritious food, and happy children.

Type B centers may be identified as "educational" day care. They provide an adequate child care program but few if any related services. These centers usually have a curriculum and, for part of the day at least, they approximate a kindergarten; they have a regulated, school-like atmosphere. Good educational centers have trained personnel on the staff and intellectually stimulating environments, i.e., games and toys designed for specific learning objectives, musical instruments, art equipment, animals, plants, good books; and they keep progress records on the children.

Type C centers might be called "developmental" or "comprehensive" because they aim to provide everything necessary for the full development of the child's physical, mental, and social capabilities. Good developmental centers conform to the Federal Interagency Day Care requirements. (Athough a large proportion of Type C centers are funded by the federal government, some centers of this type are proprietary.) A good developmental facility offers complete health care, social services to the family, parent education and involvement, in-service staff training, attention to the emotional and creative needs of children, and concern for community relations, in addition to adequate care and supervision.

Mrs. Mary Rowe's testimony, cited above, raises questions about the usefulness of this typology. This survey correlated costs with program goals rather than staff-child ratios and staff salaries.(See Appendix).

No attempt was made in this study to evaluate day care centers, either in terms of their own objectives and clientele or against some external criterial. It is apparent from the overall statistics, from a review of operator questionnaires, and from the on-site observations in six communities, however, that many centers of each type fall short of the descriptions of good facilities. On the other hand, there are some examples of good centers in each category.

Thus, it would be a mistake to equate Type C with good day care and Type A with bad or inadequate care.

Further basis for evaluation of quality and for argument with this typology may be found in Child Care Bulletins No. 1, Subject: Day Care: Resources for Decisions, Jerome Bruner's article (OEO), and No. 3, Subject: A Study in Child Care 1970-71 (Abt).

6. Unfilled Day Care Slots

An estimated 63,000 unfilled day care slots evenly divided between proprietary and nonproprietary facilities were found in this survey. Many unfilled slots also were discovered during the community studies field visits. Normal turnover may account for some of the unfilled slots and the fees of proprietary centers may explain the underenrollment in centers of this type, but nonproprietary centers usually charge less and frequently base their fees, if any, on the parents' ability to pay. The community profiles showed that location may be a critical factor in underutilization of facilities. Centers that were not fully enrolled in these communities tended to be inaccessible to families that needed them, and transportation to a day care center can be an insurmountable problem for a working mother.

Florence A. Ruderman, Child Care and Working Mothers (Child Welfare League of America, 1968), Chapters 10 and 11, surveys mothers' reasons for choosing various day care arrangements and their dissatisfaction with those which they do not choose.

7. Characteristics of User Families

Day Care centers currently do tend to serve lower-income families as earlier studies have shown. The parents of children in the day care centers surveyed were estimated by center operators to have a median income of $7,500 which is $1,100 less than the median family income for all U.S. families in 1968. A disproportionate number of single parent families use center care: nearly one-third of the families using centers are families without the father present. Most user-mothers, regardless of the presence of a man in the household, are working.

Parents of children enrolled in day care centers expect the center to provide good food, education, training, and good care. Parents of children in centers categorized as B and C types cited education as an expected provision of day care centers more frequently than parents of children in Type A centers. Apparently either those parents who most value preschool education for their children choose centers which tend to provide this element, or they have come to value education because of their exposure to it in the centers where their children are enrolled. Given the limited choice available to parents because of the scarcity and cost of day care centers, it seems likely that the second condition is operating more frequently.

Most of the working mothers whose children are in centers seem to be satisfied with group care for their children: a majority of them want no change in their day care and of those who want better day care, most would prefer an improved center rather than another type of arrangement.

Ruderman, p. 300, discusses parent inhibitions against criticizing the day care arrangements which they have found for their children. See also Child Care Bulletin No. 2, Subject: Feasibility Report and Design of an Impact Study of Day Care, which

proposes to test parental choice and satisfaction of day care alternatives in a context of multiple options.

B. Costs of Day Care

The costs of day care centers are borne principally by parents and the federal government. Other sources of revenue include state and local governments and community organizations. Exactly how much is paid from which source is impossible to determine from the available data. According to the day care operators, over half the receipts come from parent fees, but an estimated 17 percent of these fees are actually paid in full or in part by welfare grants or manpower training allowances. Some federal money channeled through state and local agencies may have been identified by respondents as local funds. As might be expected 99 percent of the income of proprietary centers is reported as parent fees, while multiple sources of support for nonproprietary centers is the rule rather than the exception.

Extreme caution must be exercised in interpreting cost data reported by day care centers. It is certain that complete costs have not been reported in many cases. *No attempt was made to impute the value of donated goods and services or rent-free space. Moreover, the concept of full-day equivalent child, used to compute costs per child, has some limitations because one actual full-day child requires more food, equipment, furniture and adult attention than two children, each of whom spends (typically) only two and a half to three hours at the center.* Nevertheless, if these limitations are understood, some useful estimates of cost, particularly comparative costs of different types of centers, can be made. For example, the median cost per month for a full-day equivalent child is $27 in Type A centers, $45 in Type B centers, and $114 in Type C centers. Since cost frequently does not include proprietor's income and since Type A centers are predominately proprietary, the median cost per child of $27 for this type of center is understated.

A different approach to the computation of per child cost of day care may be found in Child Care Bulletin No. 3, Subject: A Study in Child Care 1970-71 (Abt).

C. Mothers: Day Care Arrangements and Participation in Work Force

In this part of the survey, mothers in families with incomes of less than $8,000 and a child age 9 or under were interviewed. The purpose of these interviews was to gather information that might provide answers to the following questions:

How many of these mothers are employed?

What arrangements do the working mothers make for the care of their children?

How much do these arrangements cost?

What are these mothers' preferences in child care?

To what extent does difficulty with child care affect the labor force participation of these mothers?

1. Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers

Working mothers in the target population have 3.7 million children under 14 years of age,

1.6 million of whom are under six years old. Most of these children are cared for in their own homes and three-fourths of the mothers using in-home care said they were well satisfied with this arrangement. Of the 2 to 5 years-old in out-of-home care, 29 percent are in day care centers while 39 percent are in day care homes.

See Child Care Bulletin No. 2, Subject: Feasibility Report and Design of an Impact Study of Day Care (Center for the Study of Public Policy), for more detail on various child care arrangements.

Although a smaller percentage of children are cared for in centers than in family day care homes, more of the mothers whose children are in centers are well satisfied with this arrangement. The least satisfactory types of arrangements, according to these working mothers, are those involving a sibling or nonrelative caring for the child in the home or care in a family day care home.

The average cost for out-of-home care for seven or more hours a day is about $9.80 per week. Most in-home care is provided by a relative at no charge.

Working mothers whose children are cared for in a variety of arrangements most freqently cite good care, good food, and safety as the elements of child care they value of the provisions they expected. Only about a third of these mothers think that a day care facility should provide preschool education. (In contrast, mothers who are using centers are more likely to expect education as a provision of day care.)

2. Child Care Preferences of Working and Nonworking Mothers

As might be expected, care in the child's home is the type of arrangement that has greatest acceptability among mothers in the target population. It is used most frequently by working mothers and cited most frequently as their preference, if they went to work, by nonworking mothers. *However, there are indications in this survey of significant interest in and desire for day care centers.* Of working mothers who want better day care, about one-third would prefer care in day care centers. Nearly a third (29%) of the nonworking mothers said they would prefer care in a center, if they went to work.

Preference for day care centers over other types of arrangement is associated with race. Over half of the black mothers would like center care as compared with less than a fourth of the white mothers. As the center survey showed, black mothers have had somewhat more exposure to group day care than white mothers have. In addition, more blacks than whites have had Head Start experience. Whatever the reason, centers clearly have greater acceptance among black than white mothers.

Ruderman, Chapter 11, pp. 325ff, explores the reasons for racial variance of attitude toward day care centers.

Nonworking mothers have the same expectations of day care as working mothers have. Good food, good care, and safety have priority, with educational, social, and health provisions mentioned much less frequently.

The greatest number of working mothers in the target population (36%) stated that they would be willing to pay between $7 and $13 a week for their preference in a child care for preschool children. The next largest group (16%) said they could not afford to pay anything. Over half these mothers would not be willing to pay for care of school-age children, but 28 percent said they would pay $3 to $7 a week for before-and after-school care.

3. Relationship Between Day Care and Mothers' Employment Status

According to the nonworking mothers who had children in day care centers,[7] availability of child care is only one of a number of complex and interrelated factors involved in a woman's choice regarding employment. Inability to find a job, cited about 13 percent of the time, may be related to the low educational level of user-mothers. No interest in working was claimed without explanation in a number of cases. Nearly half of these nonworking user-mothers gave such a variety of answers that they could not be categorized. The jobs that are open to women, the salaries offered, and the mother's education and training (or lack of it) all have bearing on whether or not a mother seeks a job outside the home. Her decision is also influenced by the kind of child care arrangements she feels are necessary, the kind of child care available to her, the effect of her absence on the household, the cost of going to work, and so on.

In the area sample only 16 percent of the nonworking mothers stated absolutely that they would not work, but more than 34 percent said they preferred to be home with their children and another 18 percent said they could not make (or afford) satisfactory child care arrangements. A number of other reasons for not working were given and those who had worked since having children gave a variety of reasons, not always child-related, for having stopped working.

Other studies have shown the correlation of education and employment of women.[8] The percent of mothers in the target populations (less than $8,000 family income and child age 9 or under) who had completed twelve or more years of school is significantly less than the corresponding figure for the adult population nationwide. In addition, a smaller percentage of mothers in the target population is working than in the population of all mothers: 25 percent of the households surveyed have working mothers while 39 percent of all mothers with children under 17 and 30 percent of those with children under 6 are working.[9] Within the population surveyed, this correlation between education and employment is further demonstrated. The largest group of working mothers (15% of all mothers in the target population) has ten to twelve years of education. Very few of the mothers in the target population have more than a high school education, but a third of those who do are employed. A comparison between the educational levels of working and nonworking mothers in the survey also reinforces the significance of education: 80 percent of the working mothers have completed tenth grade or more, while only 69 percent of the nonworking mothers have had that much education.

Education apparently is a strong factor in determining whether or not a woman enters the labor force, but other factors also impinge. The presence of children is obviously a deterrent to women's work force participation; nevertheless a large number of working mothers (358,000) admitted that their child care arrangements were unsatisfactory. Yet they work. No one knows how many children of working mothers are left without adequate care and supervision. As this survey shows, many mothers take jobs regardless of the availability of acceptable child care arrangements.

7. *These mothers were surveyed in the "User Sample" and are not to be confused with parents surveyed in the "Area Sample."*

8. *Including: Ruderman, Florence A. Child Care and Working Mothers, 1968; Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers, 1968.*

9. *Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. Manpower Information Service, Vol. 2, No. 12, Feb. 24, 1970.*

The only conclusion possible is that there is no simple relationship between the availability of child care facilities and the employment of mothers. It seems unlikely that, if day care centers and homes were accessible to all mothers, the nonworking mothers would use them in order to take any job available to them. A woman might understandably prefer to stay at home with her children if she would have to pay for child care or accept an unsatisfactory arrangement in order to work at a menial, low-paid job. Of course, an unskilled, poorly educated woman might not have the choice of any job. *If both acceptable jobs and suitable day care facilities were available, however, it would appear that many of the nonworking mothers would join the labor force.*

In summary, then, most working mothers in the target population express satisfaction with their present child care arrangements. Of those who would prefer a change, about one-third would choose center care. The most frequent choice of nonworking mothers would be in-home care, followed by care in a center. Both working and nonworking mothers expect a day care program to provide good food, good care, and safety, while those mothers whose children are in centers that provide some kind of educational component also rank education high on the list of expected elements. To what extent the availability of various kinds of day care influences mothers' decisions to work has not been determined; however, the lack of adequate child care, as evaluated by the mother, may not be sufficient to prevent her from working as evidenced by the working mothers who are very dissatisfied with their present arrangements.

III. THE NEED FOR DAY CARE

Day Care for young children in the United States today is an institution lagging far behind the social change that has brought about the need for it. It is an unorganized and largely unlicensed service, provided in ways that range from excellent to shockingly poor, and yet it is indispensable to a growing number of people in present-day America: the force of working women of child-bearing age. Working mothers represent all socio-economic levels, and the family with a working mother is becoming the norm rather than the exception. In the absence of organized day care, ad hoc arrangements, which are largely impossible to assess in any accurate way, abound.

See Child Care Bulletin No. 4, Subject: A Survey of State Day Care Licensing Requirements (Conserco).

The following statistics illustrate the fact that a very few of the nation's children of working mothers are cared for in any organized way.

Children under age 6 with working mothers	3,800,000*

* *Bureau of the Census Current Population Survey, 1965. (This was the most recent statistic available.)*

Children in day care centers and family day care homes full-day	1,300,000
In centers full-day	575,000
In family day care homes full-day	712,000
Children aged 6 to 14 with working mothers	8,500,000*
Children in before and/or after school care	233,000
In public schools	21,000
In day care centers	87,000
In family day care homes	125,000

98 percent of the homes are unlicensed, and although 90 percent of the centers are licensed, it would be a mistake to assume that possession of a license assures compliance with state and local regulations.

In the six communities studied it was found that licensing agencies have neither the staff nor the funds to enforce the standards.

The need for day care among low-and moderate-income families was of particular concern in the survey reported here. The following statistics highlight the findings of this survey.

- 358,000 low-and moderate-income working mothers are very dissatisfied with their present arrangements for child care.
- An estimated three-quarters of a million low- and moderate-income mothers are not working because they cannot find satisfactory child care.
- The cost per child for full-day care in a day care center is approximately $56 per month.* Low-and moderate-income working mothers who pay for child care presently pay an average of about $35 per child per month.
- 373,000 low-and moderate-income working mothers with preschool children say that they would prefer care in a day care center for their children.

The cost figures given above are significantly lower from those derived from a survey of quality day care centers. See Child Care Bulletin No. 3, Subject: A Study in Day Care, 1970-71 (Abt).

Based on these statistics, various estimates to the extent of this need can be made. While it is not the intent of this report to make recommendations to the government, some of the

* *This estimate is low for reasons cited on page 16.*

findings raise questions relating to the definition of "need for day care" that should be considered. *Day care facilities are needed, not only for the children of poor mothers who want to work, but also for the children of already working mothers who are unable to arrange for adequate child care.* There are more than one and a half million preschool children in families with incomes of less than $8,000 whose mothers are working. Information about the arrangements made for their care is included in this report. In addition, there are an unknown number of children in families which have incomes over $8,000 only because both parents are working. How are these children cared for? While the provision of subsidized day care may enable some mothers to work, other mothers who are working now make whatever arrangements they can for the care of their children. What is happening to these children?

APPENDIX

Testimony of Mary P. Rowe, Economic Consultant, Cambridge, Massachusetts

FOREWORD:

THE ECONOMICS OF CHILD CARE

For the Senate Finance Committee:

The testimony presented here[1/] speaks to several questions:

- What is the need and what is the current demand for child care?
- Why and how is demand changing?
- How much can and will parents pay for child care?
- How important are the other major determinants of demand: location, hours and type of program; what is the relation of these factors to sliding fee scales?
- What do different kinds of child care cost? What do we know about quality-cost tradeoffs? Why do major cost studies (the erstwhile Children's Bureau's "Standards and Costs for Day Care," and Abt Associates' Study in Child Care, 1970-71 and Westat's Day Care Survey, 1970) seem to show large differences in costs?
- What are the cost implications of the Developmental vs. Custodial debate?
- How is child care presently funded?
- What are the implications of all these facts for public policy with regard to day care funding?

1/ I am indebted to many colleagues with whom I have worked on these topics: Richard Roupp, David Warner, Brigid O'Farrell, Keith McClellan, and Walter Stellwagen of Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, where much of the research was done. Also to Richard Rowe and Robert Fein of Massachusetts Early Education Project, a study of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, at Harvard University. Also to Ralph Husby of the University of Illinois. Robert Fein, David Warner and Ralph Husby are also co-authors respectively of some of the material presented here, which will appear in the forthcoming Massachusetts Early Education Project Child Care in Massachusetts, 1971; Abt Associates, Inc., forthcoming book on Day Care Needs, Costs, Costing, and Funding; Basic Books, Inc., forthcoming Day Care - Who Cares? edited by Pamela Roby.

Testimony of Mary P. Rowe

CHILD CARE IN AMERICA: NEEDS, HOPES AND COSTS

What is the need for child care in America? Many people are baffled:

- There seems to be an enormous need for child care in America, but
- There seem to be unfilled slots and unfilled day care programs, and if there is real demand, why isn't it being met the way demand for other goods and services is met?

Effective demand for child care has to be defined in terms of a given service, at a given time and place, at a given price. If you know those things, then you can say how much service of a given kind people are using. That is a question of economic fact; and this testimony presents some facts on services people are using. Potential demand is a question of politics and philosophy: How much child care service do people need? Each parent, each planner, each voter, each legislator decides the answer to this question for himself or herself. If a seven-year-old takes care of himself after school while his mother and father work, has he a need for child care? This paper presents some parental attitudes about their needs and desires for child care services. Together with facts about current supply and use of child care, these data outline the picture for parents. The costs of child care services are then discussed. Voters, legislators, planners, and prospective operators may then decide for themselves the "need" for child care services.

A. The Demand for Child Care: Needs and Hopes

What services do parents want and use?

In general, parents want child care that is:

- Free, or inexpensive relative to their budget
- Near their homes, especially if they have several children
- At the right hours for the right length of time
- Of the "right" kind, with respect to sponsorship, facilities, program, personnel.

We know these facts from analysis of services parents now are using and from their replies to attitude surveys, and will discuss each in turn. The first three facts are by far the most critical.

a. Price of Services: Current Practice and Attitudes

In the nation as a whole, 70-80% of the child care arrangements of working mothers[1] are non-monetized.[2] That is, working mothers do not generally pay in cash for their child care service. Such service is "free": from the father, grandparent, older sibling, or bartered with relatives, neighbors and friends. And at least 10% of the children 0-14 of working mothers are simply left to care for themselves during working hours.[3]

Many parents believe that child care does not or will not or should not take up too much of their income. That has been indeed a reasonable belief. Years ago most Americans lived in extended families. Children of all ages worked and played with other children and adults of all ages, apprenticed to real-life, career activities at an early age--on a farm, in a shoemaker's shop. Parents worked for themselves, for bartered goods and services; grandparents helped, often with children; the whole family worked together on daily tasks. Mothers could support and care for their families, neighbors, communities, without being paid or repaid in money.

But the picture is changing. The extended family has broken up. Many mothers feel they can better support their families by working for pay. These sociological changes, and the movement for equal pay for women, mean that child care services are moving into the monetized sector of our economy. Like shoemakers and clergymen, those who take care of children now more and more expect to be paid, since if they spent their time in other jobs, they would be paid.

Only a few percent of families with children 0-6 now have any non-parental adult living with the nuclear family, so the supply of "free" service has dropped off sharply. Opportunities for bartering or trading services are fewer and more skimpy: families move frequently, almost a third of mothers with preschoolers work outside the home, teenagers spend the bulk of their time with other teenagers. For many parents with young children, at the same time that regular, paid jobs seem more

---

1/ Probably at least 5% of the users of formal child care are single fathers, but statistics are not available for this group.

2/ Assumed to be about 85% in Low and Spindler, Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States, Children's Bureau Publication No. 461-1968, U. S. Department of Labor and U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968, Tables A-47 and A-48. Since child care is becoming increasingly monetized, we have estimated a range from 70% to 80%.

3/ 8% in Low and Spindler, op. cit., Table A-1. This is assumed to be an underestimate.

necessary and desirable, arranging child care becomes more difficult. In 1960 few parents paid more than $5 per week per child. In 1970 probably only about 5% of all parents paid more than $10 per week per child. By 1980 nearly every parent may have to pay.

What will happen in the 1970's? We expect recent trends to continue. In 1948, 10% of American mothers worked; in 1971, 43% work, including 30% of mothers with children under 6. In 1948, 10% of the U. S. labor force were women; in 1971, 42% are women. Economists expect nearly half again as many women to be working outside the home by 1980.

But how much can parents pay? Around the country, most poverty families can pay, if anything, only $2-3 a week per child--which, although it represents only 5-20% of the costs of organized child care, also represents, on the average, about 10% of family income. Average, private, child care center fees--which are in fact paid by some poverty families--come closer to 25-35% of family incomes. In general, families earning less than median incomes (about $10,000 a year) do not, and say they cannot, pay more than $6-12 per week per child (although most of the various kinds of qualities of organized care cost $15-55 per week per child). It is possible, however, that all parents (wealthy and poor) would pay more for child care that really met their needs.

In Massachusetts,[1/] when asked, how much would you be able to pay for the child care of your choice, parents responded:

	"I want the services I've got"	Nothing	$1-10/ week	$10-20/ week	$20+/ week	IK	
For one child	36% 140,400 families	8% 31,200	22% 85,800	17% 66,300	9% 35,000	8% 31,200	(100%)
For all the children	36% 140,400	2% 7,800	14% 54,600	14% 54,600	18% 70,200	15% 58,500	(99%)

(n = 390,000 families with children 0-6)

Parents say they would pay more money than they now spend if they could choose the child care they want. A third of all Massachusetts parents said they would pay more than $10 per week (for care of their choice, for their young children 0-6, excluding those in first grade).

1/ Tables are based on the results of the MEEP Survey, an area probability sample of 516 Massachusetts families with children age 0-6, conducted in November, 1970, by the Becker Research Corporation for the Massachusetts Early Education Project. The numbers are the result of an extrapolation from the percentages in the MEEP Survey, using as a base the 1970 U. S. Census datum that there are 683,161 children 0-6 in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts Early Education Project will publish Child Care in Massachusetts, a report for the Massachusetts Council on Education, in November, 1971.

However, currently parents actually pay more than $10 per week for only about 6% of the children in Massachusetts.

In summary, then, the price of child care is critical in determining demand. There are everywhere long waiting lists for free organized child care. There is practically no effective demand for child care costing over $25 per child per week, although well-staffed child care in America costs more like $40-55 per child per week (see section on costs). There is an enormous gap between what parents can and will pay, and the costs of organized or formal child care. Parents therefore rely predominantly on non-cash arrangements, but such arrangements become fewer even while the need for them grows apace. And many children especially afterschoolers, are left alone.

b. Location of Child Care

Most parents use child care in their homes or within walking distance of their homes. Careful studies of American child care service show 80-90% of child care arrangements to be in the child's own home[1] or within "three blocks of home,"[2] "within five minutes of home," "near enough so my older children join the little ones after school."[3] Use of arrangements in the home is much the most common for families with several children; generally only for only children under 14 is there any widespread use of arrangements outside the homes.[4]

There is, moreover, considerable anecdotal evidence that reliability of use of child care (and of the parents' training and working) drops off as child care arrangements are found further from home. And far more working mothers with children 0-6 in Massachusetts, when asked, say they want child care near home than close to work.[5] Many parents would in fact rather pay high fees than travel.

1/ Low and Spindler, op. cit., Talbe A-1. Depending on one's assumptions, 60-90% of child arrangements may be assumed from this report to be at or near home.

2/ See for instance, San Diego County Department of Public Welfare, Preliminary Summary of Findings, Child Care Report, Project No. 339, San Diego County Department of Public Welfare (mimeo), 1968.

3/ From an industrial survey conducted in Boston, 1970, personal communication.

4/ Low and Spindler, op. cit., Table A-1.

5/ MEEP Survey, op. cit.

Parental Choice of Child Care Arrangement -- Cost or Closeness

Next door at $15 for all children	58%	(226,200)
Free and 1/2 hour away	33%	(128,700)
Don't know	9%	(35,100)
	100%	(390,000) - total families with children 0-6

(Source: MEEP Survey, op. cit.)

Twenty-eight percent of those parents who choose "free and a half-hour away" also believe that, generally, closeness is more important than cost in selecting child care. The desire for care close to home does not vary with family income. The data also strongly suggest that whatever type of child care parents want (home or center), they tend to want it close to the family home.

Thus, location of arrangements is critical to parents. The pregnant mother with twins and triplets under three, with no car, in winter on an icy day, will perhaps illustrate the point: parents need and want child care arrangements close to home.

c. Care for the right number of hours, at the right time

Studies in Vermont,[1/] California,[2/] Illinois[3/] and a recent national study[4/] indicate that at least half of all use of arrangements made for care with anyone other than the child's parent (whether in or out of the

---

1/ State of Vermont Family Assistance Program, and Mathematica, Inc., Child Care Data Extract, from the Report on the Baseline Survey and Cost Projections, State of Vermont Family Assistance Program Planning Papers (mimeo), no address, 1971, Table XI, p. 89.

2/ San Diego Study, op. cit., front page.

3/ Personal communication from Keith McClellan, formerly of the Welfare Council of Chicago.

4/ Westinghouse Learning Corporation-Westat Research, Inc., Day Care Survey, 1970, April, 1971, Table 4.13, p. 161.

child's own home) occur outside the normal 9-5 working day, five days a week. It is probable that over half of child care services occur outside the daytime period 7 - 7. Millions of American mothers and single fathers work nights and weekends, and need child care at these times. Several comments from the 1966 report, "Day Care for Children in Massachusetts," published by the Massachusetts Commission on Children and Youth, highlight these needs:

> "I can work only on weekends, seeing as I have no one but my husband to care for our child, and this is difficult for both of us as we never have a chance to spend a full weekend together as a family. In addition, it is hard for my husband to spend the entire weekend caring for a baby after working all week himself."
>
> "I work 3:00 to 11:00 p.m. and my husband starts work at 11:00 p.m., so he doesn't get the sleep he should."

Few parents want or need to seek child care 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Most such cases are special, emergency needs, now often (although inadequately) met by neighbors and foster homes. But we estimate that at least half of all working parents need care at times outside the standard five-day week daylight hours.

Many parents choose to, or have to, make multiple arrangements for the care of their children during working hours. The most common such arrangements combine school, kindergarten and nursery school with a father or mother at home before or after work. Older siblings are kept out of school, parents stagger their working hours (and rarely see each other), grandparents and neighbors step in when other arrangements are insufficient. Probably at least a fourth of all working mothers make such multiple arrangements regularly during their children's waking hours.

In Massachusetts, 62% of the children of working mothers who are regularly cared for out of their own home, also, when in their own home, are regularly cared for by someone other than their mother for at least some of the day or night. Of these 42,356 children, 21,178 are cared for by fathers and 11,614 by babysitters. The data suggest that at least 25,000 working mothers in Massachusetts regularly make multiple arrangements for their children.[1/]

Many working mothers, in addition, ask poignantly for "a little extra child care so I can shop/do the laundry in winter/visit my relative in the hospital." It seems plain, especially for single, working parents, that an enormous need exists to provide enough child care hours at the right time.

1/ From the MEEP Survey, op. cit., see also Westat Survey, op. cit., Table 4.13, p. 161.

d. Child Care of the Right Kind and Sponsorship; Homes and Centers

Of the total number of child care arrangements in the United States, about 75% are in a home. Nationally, probably about half of all parents who want and/or need assistance in their child care would be expected to seek care in homes if it were nearby, inexpensive and the appropriate hours. Home arrangements are considered especially suitable for infants, some after-schoolers, children with special needs, children from isolated families and from large families.

In Massachusetts about 76% of young children are cared for regularly in homes:

Current Child Care Practices (excluding children in first grade)[1/]

Own home with mother	47%	282,652
Own home with father	7%	42,097
Own home with someone other than mother or father	12%	72,166
Other home	10%	60,139
Formal program (nursery school, private kindergarten, day care center, Headstart)	10%	60,139
Public kindergarten	13%	78,180
No answer	1%	6,014
	100%	601,387

Since public kindergarten is a 2-1/2 to 3 hour program, as are nursery schools and some Headstart programs, it seems likely that from 85-90% of daylight hours of child care occur in homes. Moreover, at present many parents still seek home care, especially for infants.

1/ MEEP Survey, op.cit.

Child Care Preferences of Massachusetts parents[1/]

Parents' Preferred Type of Care	Percent	Approximate Number of families	Approximate Number of children in these families
Myself at home	39%	152,100	250,000 - 270,000*
Neighbor, friend or another mother in my or another's home	39%	152,100	250,000 - 270,000*
A center	19%	74,100	100,000*- 120,000
No answer	3%	11,700	19,305
	100%	390,000	670,000 (approximately)

Many parents are delighted to have their children in centers;[2/] probably half would ultimately choose centers if they in fact knew of nearby, available places in a good center. In Massachusetts, fewer than 6,000 families use day care centers, probably under 40,000 now have any contact with any kind of center care. Parents who use and like center care often mention the opportunity for experience with other children, pre-school education programs and field trips, after-school recreation and tutoring as benefits of center programs. It seems likely that many parents who now prefer "care in a home" for their children would also choose to use regular center care (such as nursery school) for at least some hours of the day--especially for children age 2-1/2 to 5.

Interest is also rapidly mounting in mixed home-care-center-care systems. Parents and educators particularly like child care systems offering a choice of homes, centers or home-and-center care for each child. (See the section below on cost savings from mixed systems.)

Program Elements

Massachusetts parents report interest in the following characteristics of child care arrangements and programs.[3/] From this list of sixteen program characteristics, parents were asked to select those they found "most important" and "least important" in a children's program.

1/ From the MEEP Survey, op. cit. These estimates are based on an average 1.65 preschoolers per family. The ranges given for number of children are to account for the fact that we know families using home care typically have more children than families using center care (the averages are unknown).

2/ See for instance, the discussion in Part IV of Child Care and Working Mothers, by Florence A. Ruderman, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 44 East 25th Street, New York, New York, 1968.

3/ From the MEEP Survey, op. cit.

1. Would provide meals
2. Would provide health care
3. Close to home
4. A program your child could be in as long as you want
5. Would involve parents
6. Would teach children how to read
7. Would provide special toys
8. Speak many languages
9. Available anytime day or night
10. Staffed by men teachers as well as women
11. Close to place of work
12. Program with children like mine
13. Would provide TV
14. Racially integrated with children of various backgrounds
15. Would help children get along better with others
16. Give children chance to learn about community

Most Important Characteristics of Child Care Programs According to Massachusetts Parents

	Percent	Number of Families
1. Help children get along better with each other	57%	222,300
2. Close to home	41%	159,900
3. Provide Health care	36%	148,200
4. Provide meals	36%	140,400
5. Racially integrated	23%	89,700
6. Involve parents	22%	85,800

Least Important Characteristics of Child Care Programs According to Massachusetts Parents

1. Provide TV	68%	265,200
2. Speak many languages	49%	191,100
3. Provide special toys	33%	128,700

There have been many other attitude surveys asking parents what type of program they want. Comparing these surveys leads to the conclusion that parents of necessity place highest priority simply on having child care, so they can work.[1/] If you are starving and someone asks what kind of food you want, you say, "Enough, at the right times at a price I can manage." This does much to explain why parents do not, now, speak first, or most forcefully, about types of programs preferred. As child care becomes more available, however, we may expect parents to express their concerns for their children more clearly.

Sliding Scale Fee Structures

The basic question in constructing sliding scale fees is to decide how much to encourage demand and/or how much to help parents. As we have seen demand for child care is mainly a function of four factors:

1. Fees
2. Distance from home
3. Convenience of hours--whether there are enough hours at the right time for the right period of months or years
4. Type of program

Parents' commitment to work is also very important.

There are tradeoffs among these factors. For instance, about 40% of all parents may choose free, "ideal" care 1/2 hour from home to the same care next door at $15 for all children. But more parents will use child care at an inconvenient distance if they like the price and hours and program and expect the program to survive for all the years they need child care. (Most parents plan only a year ahead for child care but many care about continuity of care).

If the Government wants to help a high proportion of poor families, subsidies must be fairly high. They should be set with respect to taxable family income, adjusted for family size and perhaps for special medical and other conditions of family need. As a rule of thumb, fees should be zero for families earning less than poverty incomes (that is, about $4,000 for a family of four). Near poverty families (up to $3,000 above "poverty" income, as defined by family income) can be expected to pay no more than $6-12 per week per child or about $15 per week for all children. These fees will probably average only 15-25% of the costs of care used by such

---

1/ For instance, few surveys show any program element, like reading, to have priority for parents. The social atmosphere and health, nutrition and safety take precedence.

families, yet fees higher than $12 per week per child will result in low demand from near-poverty families.

We do not know much about demand at higher fees. It can be expected that fewer than 5% of all families in all ordinary populations will pay over $20 per week per child and fewer than 1% of all such families would now pay $40 per week. As rules of thumb, families ordinarily will not pay more than 20-30% of family incomes for child care for all children; families living more than 15 minutes away from the program need higher subsidies (in the form of transport allowance); providing care for an hour before and up to two hours after work hours will increase demand and reduce the need for subsidies.

Vacancies in Child Care Programs

Turning to the legitimate (but often unfounded) concern with "empty slots" in day care programs, we can see that where care does not meet the basic elements of parental demand, parents are unwilling or unable to fill "vacancies."

Unfilled places and slots occur for several other reasons. In proprietary centers with paying parents, unused capacity is an indication of unemployment, of economic slump--of the fact that parents cannot pay full fees, even at the many centers not meeting Federal Inter-Agency Guidelines. That money is a critical problem is borne out by the long waiting lists that everywhere characterize the provision of free and subsidized care.

Where payment for care is not the principle concern for parents (for those parents for whom Welfare Departments contract for day care "slots") money remains critical for the center operators. Welfare Departments have in the past occasionally paid for empty slots on a temporary basis in order to help non-profit centers and providers get started or expand. Neither Welfare nor other agencies have sufficient start-up funds, and so service money must be used to get child care services going. Similarly, when the allowance per slot has been set too low, Welfare Departments may have to over-buy in order to cover the full costs of day care. If Welfare can only pay 90% of the real costs of care, the Department may have to pay for "extra" slots to cover a program's expenses.

It is extremely difficult to guarantee places for WIN mothers and other child care recipients without having empty slots or waiting lists sometimes; programming is difficult because children need continuity of service and cannot be moved around just to fill slots "efficiently." However, the total number of such "unfilled" places in child care programs is actually only a tiny percentage of total child services delivered.

Summary: The Elements of Demand for Child Care

Patterns of use of child care arrangements make very clear that finances, geographical convenience and appropriateness of hours of child care are of necessity the parent's first concern. When these primary needs are met, parents then can--and do--express their strong preferences for various program types and elements. Given a choice, some parents would always choose large, school-like centers; others would always choose tiny, cozy home substitutes. Some clearly want an educational environment at least corresponding to the responsive stimulation of middle-class homes. Other parents care only that their children in their absence be safe and protected. And many parents have different views over time, with respect to different children, and with respect to their children at different ages.

For these reasons, diversity seems a critical element of demand as we know it, even after distance, financial need and appropriate hours have been taken into consideration.

75-90% of all parents[1/] might be expected to use free,nearby, or in-home child care of the "right" kind, at hours appropriate to their work, training and other needs. Conversely, fewer than 1% of all parents will use well-staffed child care for which they must pay full costs. And demand is both unreliable and weak where child care is very inconvenient or at the wrong hours.

B. The Supply Side: Costs, Quality and Funding Issues

This section is concerned with supplying the child care parents want: what do different kinds of child care cost and how can these costs be met? Understanding child care costs, so as to be able to compare different programs, requires discussion of why costs vary so much among different programs:

- Children's Bureau figures put the average cost of "desirable" care at $2,300 - 2,400 per child-year;[2/] so does the Abt study[3/]

1/ Probably at least 10% of the child population has at some time some special need that might keep a parent from using ordinary child care.

2/ Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, "Standards and Costs for Day Care," 1968 (hereinafter called the CB-DCCDC Budget).

3/ Abt Associates, Inc., A Study in Child Care, 1970-71 (OEO Contract No. OEO-B00-5213), 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, April, 1971.

- Westat Survey figures show "custodial" care being delivered for $354 per child-year[1/]

- Commercial child care in America costs $1,000 - 2,000 per child-year; nonprofit child care is often more like $2,000 per child-year.

What do these figures mean and how are the differences to be explained? There are three major reasons why these costs vary so much: they have to do with data questions, pricing questions and "quality" and efficiency questions. The first two are easy. Defining terms, standardizing "units" of service, and deflating for region of the country and inflation changes, bring us to the point where we are all talking about the same resources used for child care. "Quality" and efficiency questions are more difficult, for the quality of child care lies to some extent in the eye of the beholder. One man's slum is another man's palace, or prison, or haven; so also with child care. Unless we agree about "quality," it is impossible to discuss "efficiency," for efficiency means delivering a given level of quality at the least cost. One observer will say "more resources are used at Center X than Center Y; the service must be better there at X." Another will day, "Centers X and Y have the same service but more resources are used at X so Y is more efficient." These issues are discussed in this section in the context of major cost studies and the "Developmental" vs. "Custodial" debate on child care. The section then concludes with discussion of how child care costs are presently met and how they may be met in the future.

1. Data Questions

There are many differences in how costs and services are reckoned. In order to be able to compare programs and estimate the need for resources, line-item budgets and program information must be put into standard form. Perhaps the easiest form uses:

- a standard, 10-hour program, day or night[2/]

- a standard, 250-day year (52 weeks, ten holidays)[2/]

- "full-time equivalents" (FTE) for children and staff reckoned in terms of hours of service delivered. Thus the staff-child ratio is staff hours (paid and unpaid) divided by child-hours. The cost per child-hour is the cost for hours children actually use, not hours the program is open. Although the standard program is

---

1/ Westinghouse Learning Corporation (Westat Research), OEO Contract No. 800-5160. Day Care Survey 1970, April 16, 1971.

2/ The CB-DCCDC "Standards and Costs" conform to these standards.

open 10 hours, the average child is at the center 8.5 hours.[1/] Thus, three children who are present, respectively, three hours, three hours and two and a half hours, represent one full-time equivalent child. Cost per child-hour delivered, and costs per day, for a full-time equivalent child, will thus be about 15% higher than if centers were filled throughout the day. Costs on this basis give a more accurate picture of child care costs.

- Costs per child-year, both on an average daily attendance basis and on an enrollment basis. The Abt Study gives costs on the basis of average daily attendance (ADA), which conforms better with the standard we have given for costs per child-hour or child-year delivered. However, nearly all other studies, including the CB-DCCDC "Standards and Costs," give costs per year on an enrollment basis. In the Abt Study, ADA was found on the average about 12% less than enrollment, but there was a fairly wide range of differences between the ADA and enrollment for a given center. There is, for instance, some evidence indicating that absenteeism is higher--almost double--where parents must travel 15-30 minutes than if they can walk to their child care programs. Costs for services actually delivered will thus be higher at such a center. Instead of receiving 250 days of service less 12%, the average such parent receives 250 days less 25%; the cash costs per hour of service used are thus higher at such a program. If the parent is paying the costs we can say that the parent has "paid his money and taken his choice of service or not-service," (although many parents have real difficulty in winter travelling daily with little children and the "choice" is in many ways forced). But if the government is paying the costs, the difference between ADA and enrollment may seem to be a public issue, and the government may attempt to bring down the costs of service (delivered) by over-enrolling (if absenteeism is fairly reliable), or by providing child care near parents' homes.

- Fully costed budgets. This means that costs are given or imputed for all resources used by all programs. This requirement is critical to program comparison for two reasons. The proportion of budgets in-kind (donated and volunteered) is very variable, ranging in the Abt Study from 5 to 70% (the average was 23%). The future supply of donations and volunteers cannot be accurately predicted (empty church basements are disappearing and women now more and more are working for pay, but teenagers, grandparents, and men are becoming more and more involved). Thus the time of proprietors should be "salaried" at going rates; inordinate overtime or vacations given up by staff should be costed. The parent-

---

1/ This is the average found in the Abt Study; it is substantiated by averages reported in the Westat Survey, op. cit., Tables 3.11 and 4.14. The Abt Study gives costs per child-hour on this basis of child-hours used, not those available.

Saturdays contributed for making equipment, and the nightly phone calls for fund-raising and parent consultation, must be included as costable staff time if program inputs are to be compared.

- Separate budgets for recurrent costs and start-up costs. Recurrent costs are those borne yearly, including amortization of buildings and major equipment. (Amortization may be implicit in rental figures.) Start-up costs are the once-only costs of beginning a program or conducting major expansions. They include finding and renovating space; licensing; recruitment and initial training of staff (over and above the level that recurs); payments for staff, interest, utilities and space before the program opens; fund-raising, community relations, program planning, and ordering supplies (over and above the level that recurs); the time spent getting loans and mortgages. They do not include interest on loans for buildings, equipment and working capital after the program is underway. Fully costed (cash paid) start-ups may cost $500 - 1,000 per child, but typically many resources are donated. Beginning viable new programs usually takes at least an aggregate person-year of time and effort.

It will be seen at once that these points account for many of the differences in reported costs of child care. For instance, in many commercial centers the proprietor's profits, if any, are his "salary"; sometimes his returns are derived chiefly from owning the building, through renting to himself and tax write-offs. It is common for members of the proprietor's family to work unpaid, for families to live at a center and/or eat program food. In the Westat Survey, the interviews did not pick up this type of information about in-kind resources. Calculation of full-time equivalent children in that Survey was based on a seven-hour "full day" and two part-time children were considered equal to one full-time child, even though the typical part-time child is present for only 2-1/2 to 3 hours. This calculation over-estimates the number of children, and under-estimates costs, with respect to our "standard," by at least 10-20%. Moreover, number of days per year are not specified in that Survey. This can be important; the range in days per year in the Abt Study was 225 days to 253 days.

Taken in the aggregate, the data differences alone easily account for the reported differences in costs between the "developmental" centers of the Westat Survey (average cost $1,368) and the centers and systems of the Abt Study (average cost about $2,300). The problem of data differences should also be kept in mind in comparing day care costs with public school costs (for a five-to-seven hour day, 180 days per year), which usually do not include costs of central administration, occupancy, land values, land taxes foregone, free lunches and medical care, etc.

2. Pricing Questions: Regional Differences and Inflation

The Abt Study and CB-DCCDC budget are in terms of national, average costs. Prices vary around the country by as much as 100%, and should therefore be price-adjusted for each individual state. For example, using National Education Association teacher-salary indices for this purpose (day care teachers receive, on the average, about 65% of public elementary school salaries but vary in about the same way among states), the Massachusetts index is 103.1. Urban prices within one state usually exceed rural prices, in Massachusetts by as much as 10% or even more. Thus the Abt and CB-DCCDC averages should be multiplied by 103% for a Massachusetts average, and by as much as 110% or more for the Boston metropolitan area.

The CB-DCCDC budgets date from late 1960's data; the Westat and Abt studies refer mainly to 1970 data. Inflation effects have been uneven, because of unemployment and differential real estate changes, but clearly prices have been rising. Salaries may be expected to continue to rise due to unionization of child care workers, equal pay for women, the increased hiring of men, cost of living adjustments, and, possibly, some difficulty in securing scarce resources (space, directors) as day care becomes more common, and more and more arrangements are cash paid.

Thus day care programs beginning in 1972 would be expected to cost at least 10-20% more thanthe budgets presented in the Appendix simply for pricing reasons. [Mrs. Rowe included in the Appendix the figures from "Costs of Day Care Programs," (#13; $.50), which may be ordered from the Day Care and Child Development Council of America.]

3. Questions of Costs and Quality

In this section we will survey three studies of day care costs upon which cost estimates for national child care are being based, analyze the reasons for differences in costs and estimate costs appropriate for universal national child care for 0-6 year olds. Assuming all the data problems and definitions resolved, remaining differences in costs should be due to differences in quality of service delivered. But what is "quality"? What would these "quality differences" be? In fact there are at present no adequate ways to measure the effects and/or quality of child care, and the measures we do have show no reliable "output" differences among programs[1/] (except for programs clearly unsafe or otherwise abusive to children). Such measures and evaluations as we have are mostly oriented to cognitive achievement and are controversial

---

1/ See for instance the well-known discussion of this point by Professor Carl Bereiter, "An Academic Proposal for Disadvantaged Children: Conclusions from Evaluation Studies," a paper presented at the Johns Hopkins University, February 1971.

with respect to goals[1/] and methods of use.[2/] The critical question of measuring social and emotional development of children is still in infancy.[3/] How then may we evaluate program differences resulting in differences in costs?

Presently there is a hot debate on "Developmental" versus "Custodial" care, of "Desirable" versus "Minimum Care." In the absence of acceptable ways to measure the effects (output) of different programs, we shall discuss implicit and explicit definitions of "quality" used in the three major cost studies now available. It will be seen that prevailing views of quality are defined in these three studies in one or more of the following different ways:[4/]

- presence or absence of a "preschool program" or explicit early childhood education activities,

- program scope, defined as the presence or absence of educational programs, meals, transport, medical care, staff training, community work, parent counseling, etc.,

- staff-child ratios (teacher-child ratio, administrator-child ratio, supplement program staff-child ratio); more staff-time per child is considered more favorable.

1/ See for instance Cole, Michael and Jerome S. Bruner, "Preliminaries to a Theory of Cultural Differences," (mimeo), Rockefeller University and Harvard University, n.d.

2/ See for instance, Campbell, Donald and Albert Erlbacher, "How Regression Artifacts in Quasi-Experimental Evaluations Can Mistakenly Make Compensatory Education Look Harmful," in The Disadvantaged Child, Vol. III, pp. 185-210, edited by Jerome Hellmuth, Brunner-Mazel, NYS, 1971.

3/ Personal communication with Dr. Dan Ogilvie, Cambridge, Massachusetts, a leading researcher in the field.

4/ It is not the intention of the present authors to support the following operational definitions of quality to the exclusion of others. These three points may be considered as indicators of and pointers toward quality. Moreover, a favorable staff-child ratio may be a necessary but probably not sufficient factor in child care quality. Finally, since quality is "in the eyes of the beholder," it seems likely that different parents will for a long time have different views of quality.

The CB-DCCDC Study

Perhaps the most widely quoted set of data on the cost of day care was assembled in the late 1960's by Jule Sugarman, then of the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare[1] and Lawrence Feldman, then of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America. Separate estimates are available for:

- full-day care in a center (ten to twelve hours per day, 52 weeks per year),
- full-day organized family day care in which one woman cares for four to six infants and/or children in her own home, approved, paid and supervised by Government or other agency (ten to twelve hours per day, 52 weeks per year),
- before and after school, and summer care for school-age children.

Before analyzing the cost of these different types of day care, the HEW data are broken down by differing "quality" of care:

- minimum quality,
- acceptable quality,
- desirable quality.

Minimum quality was defined as "the level essential to maintain the health and safety of the child, but with relatively little attention to his developmental needs"; acceptable quality was defined "to include a basic program of developmental activities as well as providing minimum custodial care"; and desirable quality was defined "to include the full range of general and specialized developmental activities suitable to individualized development."[2] The figures in the table "represent a consensus among a number of experts of what would be required at each level of quality. The figures for desirable care represent far from the best facilities, staff, and equipment that money can buy but take into account budgetary limits."[3]

1/ The Children's Bureau has since become the Office of Child Development, HEW. Jule Sugarman is now Human Resources Administrator in New York City.

2/ "Standards and Costs for Day Care," first page; their italics.

3/ Lawrence C. Feldman, Executive Director, National Committee for the Day Care of Children, "Memo to Staff, Senate Finance Committee Re: Day Care Programs Authorized by H.R. 12080," p. 3.

Table 1

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE
PER CHILD PER YEAR (CB-DCCDC)

	Minimum	Acceptable	Desirable
Day Care Center (pre-schoolers)	$1,245	$1,862	$2,320
Family Day Care (0-6)	1,423	2,032	2,372
Before and After School and Summer	310	653	653

Source: "Standards and Costs for Day Care," op. cit., Table 1.

Detailed CB-DCCDC budgets for these three quality levels of center care and family day care are included in Appendix A as Tables 1 and 2. The marginal cost of each superior quality level is presented in Appendix A, Table 3. Careful analysis of the three quality levels shows that costs vary with the staff-child ratio: nearly all the increase in costs for higher levels of quality can be attributed to more staff time.

Family day care is often thought to be inexpensive. It will be seen here to be approximately as expensive as center care because the adult/child ratio is more favorable, (a critical fact since most organized infant care is in family day care). That this is accomplished without raising costs above those of center care is due to the fact that provider mothers' salaries in family day care are only slightly above poverty level (in many individual cases below poverty level).

With respect to centers, "increases in quality,"between minimum care and desirable care, can be attributed about 60% to more staff in teaching, and supervising in the classroom. Another 30% of the increase in quality is to be accomplished through expanding the program's scope: an extra meal, transport, medical care, parent and community work, and teacher training. Expanding program scope may be seen principally to benefit adults; the children receive directly only the meal and medical care. A final 10% in quality improvement is to be accomplished through extending space, supplies and especially, administration. Seen another way, the improvements in quality which affect the children directly are considered to be almost entirely in providing extra staff who work directly with children. That is, "quality" increases in the CB-DCCDC program are presented chiefly in terms of a more favorable staff-child ratio.

The Abt Associates Study

A study by Abt Associates[1/] provides a second major source of data and information on child care centers. This study involved an in-depth

1/ Abt Associates, Inc., A Study in Child Care, 1970-71, four volumes, prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to OEO contract No. B00-5213, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April, 1971.

description and analysis of 20 day care centers and systems which the directors of the study believed were among the better centers and systems of their kind in the country."[1]

In selecting these centers, quality was not rigorously defined, but rather it was assumed that "well-known child care centers are doing a good job, and that these centers could be described."[2] First, 132 "quality" centers were nominated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, the Child Welfare League, the Urban League, and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America.[3] Forty-two centers were chosen for further study, and finally 20 centers were selected. "Final selection was based on overall project quality, presence and variety of quality program elements, and coverage of 'special case' situations."[4] Final selection represented "high quality" centers in different geographical locations serving groups of diverse ethnic and economic backgrounds.

Budget Analysis: Functional Budgeting in the Abt Study

In analyzing the very varied costs of the programs covered by the survey, the Abt team imputed costs to all major in-kind resources except the services of trustees, and adjusted for regional and fiscal year differences. Line item budgets were then transformed into functional budgets[5] to permit analysis of major activities and a breakdown between personnel and non-personnel costs. (In functional budgeting cost data is collected from line item budgets: so much money for a director, for

---

1/ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 5.

2/ Ibid., p. 4.

3/ Abt Associates, Inc., op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 6.

4/ Ibid.

5/ The technique for doing this is to be published in 1972 by Abt Associates, Inc., 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. See also the similar but far more detailed plan for functional budgeting prepared by Keith McClellan and available from the Welfare Council of Chicago, 64 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, July, 1971. The former system is simple to use; suitable for rule of thumb analysis in all types of child care operations. The latter method is a more sophisticated management tool requiring excellent records and considerable expertise.

crayons, etc. These costs are then allocated to program activities: teaching, medical care, etc. A worksheet for functional budgeting is in Appendix A as Figure 1.) Functional budgeting is essential to determine which activities all child care programs provide and the depth of the activities; which are supplementary, for whose (direct) benefit they are intended, and what percent of the budget is allocated. It is also essential for comparing budgets on these points.

The functional budgets used by Abt reduce all (recurrent) expenditures to Child Care and Teaching, Administration, Occupancy, Feeding, Health, Transportation and Supplemental Programs. The first four functions are Standard Core Activities performed by all full-day programs. Health is a Varying Core function provided by some programs; Transportation and Supplemental Programs appear if at all in very varied form.1/

Based on their study of these 20 centers and systems, Abt also outlined and estimated the cost of model programs for day care centers of 25, 50 and 75 children. These programs were considered to be "good" and were designed to include "early childhood education." An average teacher-child ratio of 1:5 was considered "sensible," with more favorable ratios for very young children.2/

The three different sizes of day care programs are assumed to be nonprofit and existing in an urban setting. They operate from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, 52 weeks a year. They involve care for children three to five years old not including any severely handicapped children. All include an equal number of classes for 10 children and 15 children, the older children in the larger classes. There is one teacher and one assistant teacher in each class with a "floating aide" for every two classes. It is assumed that no volunteer labor is available (these budgets, like the CB-DCCDC budget are fully-costed, but a budget could be fully worked out and then some staff positions filled by volunteers or equipment donated). Each center uses a single building with adequate indoor and outdoor space. The staff training programs consists of initial orientation and in-service training. No formal educational requirements are set since "formal education does not seem to be a reliable indicator of staff quality."3/

Services at these centers include child care and teaching, and minimal health services. All children would be required to have medical and dental examinations before admission and annually thereafter, but

---

1/ Appendix Table 4 summarizes the expenditures in each category by percent of each of the twenty centers and systems included in the Study of Child Care, 1970-71.

2/ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 44.

3/ Ibid., p. 47.

would receive all innoculations and immunizations as needed. All centers would serve hot lunches and morning and afternoon snacks.

Here, we will concentrate on a day care center with an average daily attendance (ADA) of 25 children. The staff of ten includes:

1 director, full-time

1 secretary, 1/4 time (10 hours per week)

2 teachers, full-time

2 assistant teachers, full-time

1 aide, full-time

1 cook, part-time (20 hours per week)

1 custodian, part-time (10 hours per week)

1 nurse, part-time (4 hours per week)

MODEL FUNCTIONAL BUDGET FOR A CENTER
WITH TWENTY-FIVE CHILDREN (ADA)

Category	Percent of Total Cost	Total Cost	Cost per Child
Care and Teaching	52%	$30,803	$1,232
Administration	22	12,845	514
Feeding	12	6,893	276
Health	1	824	33
Occupancy	13	7,354	294
TOTAL	100%	$58,719	$2,349

Source: Abt Associates Inc., A Study in Child Care, 1970-71, Vol. III, Table II, p. 53.

In Appendix Table 5, the detailed budget is presented. Personnel costs amount to 76% of total costs while 6% is for food and 9% for rent. According to the Abt study, "costs are representative of what was found in our sample of quality centers. [However, costs] may vary considerably from these estimates depending on local market conditions." Personnel costs are based on the average salaries paid at the sampled centers.

CB-DCCDC-Abt Budget Comparison

The "desirable" CB-DCCDC budget and the Abt budget appear quite similar in cost per child, but it should be remembered that the Abt

budget costs are for ADA children. Thus the average Abt cost per enrolled child is not $2,349, but about $2,067. Moreover, inflating the CB-DCCDC budget (which was drawn from late 60's data), to 1971 figures would probably raise the cost per child for the "desirable" program to $2,500 to $2,600. (An exact figure cannot be given without analysis of the data used to construct the budgets.) With these two points in mind, the higher cost is largely accounted for by transportation, the social worker and specialized classroom personnel provided in the CB-DCCDC budget and a more favorable staff-child ratio in the CB-DCCDC program. Otherwise, functional analysis of both budgets shows similar percentages spent for staff functions (the job titles are different, but the functions are similar).

Abt Associates found "warmth" of center (measured in terms of teacher response to children) to be highly significantly correlated with teacher-child ratio and administrator-child ratio. "Scope of program" (presence of supplemental programs) was not clearly related to "warmth of center." The Abt model program is, therefore, intended to represent just standard child care activities for the direct benefit of children. (Supplemental programs can easily be added to the standard budget; a discussion of these programs and their costs from the Abt study is presented as Appendix B. The range in additional cost due to supplemental programs and transportation was 0-37%.)

Since the administrator-child ratio was found to be an even better predictor of "warmth" of center than the teacher-child ratio,[1/] the Abt model programs emphasize the director. In actual fact the director usually combines in one person many of the staff functions separately presented in the CB-DCCDC budget. The pie charts for directors' time in the Abt study show a good deal of staff training, parent counseling, community work, business functions, etc., to be normal (not "supplemental program") activities by directors.

The Abt study found that cooks are often important "teachers," who buy, prepare and serve food with the children. The presence of a cook and some price differences (notably rentals) complete the other differences between the "desirable" CB-DCCDC and Abt budgets.

In summary those who designed these two model budgets agree upon an operational definition of "quality" which emphasizes personnel inputs and consists primarily of child care and teaching personnel in favorable teacher-child ratio. An important but secondary emphasis is placed on support personnel, whose major function is to support teachers in working with children.

1/ Both were highly significantly correlated with warmth.

Economies of Scale; Possible Advantages for Centers Organized in Systems

For the model (Abt) child care centers with an ADA of 50 and 75 children, total cost comes to $111,135 and $164,186 respectively, with per child cost dropping to $2,223 and $2,189 (ADA). Cost per child-hour decreases to $1.06 and $1.04.

The 20 in-depth studies suggested that as the number of children in the center increases, the amount of staff time necessary for teaching and the time required of nurses rises proportionately, but for cooks and maintenance staff, the time rises slightly less than proportionately. For larger centers, the support staff remains the same but works longer hours.[1/] The need for administrative staff rises slightly less than proportionately.[2/] The actual cost estimates indicate that the economies of scale are modest: $2,223 and $2,189 for 50 and 75 (ADA) centers, respectively, compared to $2,349 for the center with an ADA of 25.

It is possible that these figures underestimate the possible gain in efficiency. It was assumed not only that occupancy cost per square foot remains constant as size of center increases, but also that the total square feet of space required per child does not change with the number of children served. Although this assumption was made, the study suggests that space required may decrease somewhat.[3/] The size of the kitchen, administrative offices, and the outdoor playground area may not need to increase proportionately.

However, even the small decrease in per child cost for the large centers may be illusory. The authors of the study believe that "the larger centers seem to find it harder to provide quality child care even when they can maintain favorable staff ratios.[4/] It is suggested that administrative problems may be the cause. Thus, for a given level of quality there may be no gain in efficiency from larger size, within a single center.

1/ Abt Associates, op. cit., pp. 40, 50.

2/ Ibid., p. 43.

3/ Ibid., p. 63.

4/ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 8. Italics ours. "Quality" throughout Vol. I of that Study is defined chiefly in terms of "warmth" of center. Elizabeth Prescott of Pacific Oaks has reached similar conclusions in "The Large Day Care Center as a Child-Rearing Environment."

Possible Gains to be Derived from Systems of Centers

The Abt survey included only seven systems, one of which is a family day care system. On the average, system costs were lower than for single centers (See Appendix Table 4), but the range in costs was very wide. Possibly due to the small size of the sample, no statistically significant difference in costs was found between centers organized in systems and independent centers (nor was there a significant difference between them in "warmth"). Further research is needed to ascertain if there may not be administrative economies associated with systems of centers. Clearly fund-raising, and the ability to attract top professional staff, are advantages with systems.

There also may be major cost advantages from mixed, home-care-center-care systems. Experience with such systems is at present too scanty to be sure, but some of the following points may obtain.[1/]

Center care and home care each, respectively, cost less for certain categories of children (e.g., certain kinds of disabilities; infants and isolated children). A mixed system might permit most children to be in their least expensive care. A mixed system can probably respond faster and with less expense to changes in demand, reduce transport costs, widen the pool of volunteers and donations. (Some volunteers and donations are more easily recruited by homes, others by centers.) Staff training, health care and career parent support in family day care are probably less expensive when associated with a center; top professionals may be more easily attracted to mixed systems (especially men); emergency care is simpler in a mixed system; facilities costs may be lower in some instances. All of these considerations lead to the speculation that child care in mixed, home-care-center-care systems might be delivered for about $2,000 per child-year (recurrent costs, 1971 dollars).

The Westinghouse-Westat Survey

A third source of data and information on day care is found in another survey conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1970.[2/] The study included a survey of 289 day care centers, 577 parent users, and an area probability sample of 134 day care homes and 1,812 families which were potential users of day care, each having at least one child nine years old or younger and each with family income below $8,000. It makes no attempt to evaluate centers, but more completely describes what exists in the form of full-day (not part-day child care, Head Start or part-day Kindergartens) than any other study.

1/ The points which follow are suggested by the consulting experience of one of the authors.

2/ Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research, Inc., Day Care Survey 1970, Report to the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to contract OEO B00-5160, April 1971.

Three different types of day care were distinguished in the Westat study. Type A is defined as "custodial [offering] food, shelter, and supervision, but makes no attempt to provide education or other services, such as health care and family counseling." Type B is defined as "educational [offering] food, shelter, adult supervision, and some kind of educational program." And Type C is defined as "developmental [offering] food, shelter, adult supervision, and educational program, and all or some of the following components--health care, parent participation, counseling, social and creative activities."[1/] The centers of the sample were categorized as A, B, or C by an expert in child care on the basis of the facility, staff, equipment, program, and the ancillary services. It should be emphasized that designations A, B and C were not interpreted as "poor," "good," "excellent." The Survey did not involve an evaluation of centers: they were classified on the basis of program goal rather than success at achieving goals.

The survey results indicate that Type A day care costs averaged $324 a year, B about $540 a year, and C $1,368 a year per full-time equivalent child. Comparing proprietary and non-proprietary centers, where proprietary is defined as a center "operated for profit," average cost for the former was $456 and for the latter was $1,140.

Westat, CB-DCCDC and Abt Budget Comparison

The Westat cost figures seem strikingly different, but unfortunately cannot easily be compared with the CB-DCCDC and Abt budgets. The cost interview was necessarily brief and did not include the days of data search performed in the narrower Abt survey. In-kind resources were probably much underestimated.[2/] Space costs appear to have been reported unevenly and less reliably than other costs. The cost of management (especially of managers "paid" via profits, and rentals on buildings), and of staff contributing overtime is included irregularly, probably less reliably for proprietary centers. The reckoning of "full-time equivalent" children was not done on an hourly basis but by combining two part-time children, which leads to an underestimate of costs, and it is also not clear just how food and health costs were handled for part-time children. Because of these and other limitations, no functional budgeting or staff-child analysis can be attempted for comparisons with CB-DCCDC and Abt budgets.

Aside from data problems, it seems very unlikely that the reported differences in costs between Types A and C are solely attributable to

---

1/ Ibid., p. 8.

2/ The interested reader may wish to refer to the Westat and Abt questionnaires available from these two companies. One of the present authors, in costing dozens of child care programs, (proprietary and non-proprietary), has yet to find a program with fewer than 5% of the resources in-kind.

differences in scope of activities despite the fact that the types are nominally differentiated in terms of scope. An "educational service," says a Bereiter-Engelmann program regularly taught by a Type A teacher might conceivably double the cost of the Type A program (materials, teacher training, etc.) but certainly would not quadruple the costs. Moreover, as we have seen, health, parent programs, etc., add only marginally to child care budgets. The differences are probably basically due to differences in staff-child ratio, (where most of the extra staff in the more costly programs are classroom-oriented rather than in "supplemental programs") and to salary differences.1/

In the Abt survey, for instance, the overall, average, child-related staff-child ratio was about 1:4. Early results of the Westat survey showed Type C centers to have an average, child-related staff-child ratio of about 1:6 and the average Type A center ratio about 1:15.2/ Questions of number of staff and program scope are related, and it is difficult to know how staff were counted in the Westat Survey, but the most important differences between centers surveyed by Westat and those surveyed by Abt seems to be the differences in staff-child ratio. This is a critical matter for national planners, since Type A, and many Type B centers would not meet Federal Inter-agency Guidelines on the books in 1970.3/ Moreover, many people feel that on the principle of "first doing no damage" that they prefer centers with a home-like staff-child ratio.

The second major difference has to do with salaries. The national median salary reported by Westat for staff and directors was just above poverty level, and most Category A workers were below the poverty level for a family of four.

1/ Increases is cost due to supplemental programs and activities are primarily staff costs, so there is an overlap between the increase in cost due to "scope of activities" and the increase due to a more favorable, overall staff-child ratio. It is however, the teacher-child ratio improvement which is at issue here and which probably accounts for more of the differences in costs between Type A and Type C centers than does "scope of activities."

2/ From an OEO work progress statement dated 1 March 1971.

3/ As of September, 1971, it appeared that the Requirements might specify a teacher-child ratio of 1:4 for infants and 1:8 for preschoolers. The overall, child-related staff-child ratios in programs meeting the Requirements would therefore be even more favorable than 1:4 and 1:8.

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES
OF FULL-TIME DAY CARE CENTER STAFF BY CATEGORY

Salary per Month	Category A	Category B	Category C
$300 or less	76.1%	47.8%	26.3%
301 - 400	16.1	29.0	29.8
401 - 600	5.8	18.2	34.8
601 - 800	2.0	3.9	6.7
801 - 1,000	0.0	0.8	2.0
1,001 -	0.0	0.3	0.4

Source: Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research, Inc., Day Care Survey 1970. Table 2.50, p. 74.

Presumably the Federal Government, in any Federally supported child care program must expect to pay salaries well above the present norm, because of Federal minimum wages, equal employment opportunity laws, projected unionization of teachers, further teacher training and certification, etc. Thus the CB-DCCDC and Abt budget salaries must be seen as far more realistic for national planning.

Returning to the three indicators of "quality" mentioned earlier, it will be seen that the three have very different cost implications. An "educational program package" could be added to a 50-child "custodial" program (for one to two hours a day for each child), for about $3 per week per child. This cost would include materials, and an increase in salary (over the national median) for a specially trained teacher but would not much affect the teacher-child ratio. It is doubtful that such an addition would affect childrens' cognitive development, but our present measures are inadequate to be sure. (We also do not know how educational programs work if they work. It may be that the expectations of teachers or interaction with teachers or presence in a school-like environment is what causes such changes as do occur. Possibly such programs work by increasing the staff time devoted to certain individual children.[1/])

One can also enormously expand educational opportunities for children throughout a full day. Doing this would mean adding significantly to staff time and is, therefore, discussed below as a change in teacher-child ratio.

"Expanding the scope" of a standard core "custodial" program (adding supplementary programs) would add more to costs, perhaps as much as 20-30% to a standard core budget of any initial level. These additional funds would be used primarily for the (direct) benefit of adults rather than for increasing staff time with children.

1/ There is some evidence comparing Sesame Street to real-teacher programs that suggests that "educational activities" accomplish more when there is "human" (as distinguished from TV) teaching time involved. See Sprigle, Herbert A., "Can Poverty Children Live on 'Sesame Street'?" in Young Children, Vol. XXVI, No. 4 (March, 1971), pp. 202-218.

Improving the teacher-child ratio adds much more to costs[1/] but favorable ratios are the implicit mechanism of ensuring quality as seen by the CB-DCCDC staffs and the directors of most of the centers and systems surveyed by Abt. In addition, the salient cost differences between Type A and Type C centers in the Westat Survey are probably primarily teacher-related, as are differences in "warmth" and costs among the centers in the Abt Study. Improving teacher-child ratios usually also implies that the extra teachers are motivated to provide a stimulating, educational environment and program for children and may also add to program scope.[2/] The teacher-child ratio thus appears by far the most powerful influence on both costs and "quality," as operationally defined in the studies citied, and is mainly responsible for the designations "desirable" and "developmental."

In summary, there appear to be clear trade-offs between costs and quality, where quality is defined first in terms of staff-child ratio and secondarily in terms of program scope. Presence or absence of an "educational program" is not a comparably vital issue for costs. Meeting Federal Inter-agency Requirements, providing a home-like environment, planning that meets the Children's Bureau "desirable" "Standards," results in budgets reflecting costs of at least $2,000 per child-year.[3/]

Funding: Who Pays?

Previous sections show that fully-costed, "good" child care costs upwards of $2,000 per child-year, not including start-up costs and bureaucratic costs. Child care with less favorable staff-child ratios and with narrower "scopes," (but licensable in most states), costs from $1,000 -$2,000 per child-year. We know that most parents will not or cannot pay even $20 per week per child. So who pays the cost of child care?

The Abt and Westat studies give a clear picture of the funding of formal American child care. In the Abt Study of "good: child care,

---

1/ The increase in costs for given changes in ratios and salaries has been worked out in a computer model published as: Potential Cost and Economic Benefits of Industrial Day Care, A Report prepared by the Inner City Fund for the U. S. Department of Labor, May, 1971.

2/ Conversely, adding "educational activities" and widening program scope do not necessarily make much difference to the teacher-child ratio.

3/ Section 3, "Questions of Cost and Quality" will appear in Day Care--Who Cares?", edited by Pamela Roby (Basic Books, 1972) as part of the chapter on "Economics of Child Care," co-authored by Ralph Husby.

Federal, state and local governments were found to supply about half of all resources to formal child care. Another 23% of all resources were in-kind (volunteers and donations). About 10% of all resources come from private and community agencies, and parent fees account for only 15% of total costs.

The Westat Survey data are not dissimilar. The Survey did not adequately collect data on in-kind resources (estimated by one of the present authors as 5-10% of the resources used in proprietary programs and 15-25% of the resources used in non-proprietary programs). With respect to other sources of funds, Westat also found over half of total resources to come from Federal, state and local government agencies, including Welfare.[1/] On the same basis, parent fees accounted for 40% of total costs.

C. Federal Policy Alternatives

If good child care costs at least $2,000 per child year (fully-costed, national average, recurrent costs in 1971 dollars) a broad Federal child care program will plainly be very expensive. There are five major policy alternatives:

- The Federal Government could provide good care for a few children, full-time, for example, for the children from poverty families. Or perhaps more children could be helped with part-time options available. If the sixth of all American children living in poverty families were provided good, free care, America's very poor and very wealthy families would be well-served with child care. This would meet the concerns of those who want directly to improve the lives of poor children; who want to improve the opportunities for such children, and who wish to facilitate the working lives of the parents involved.

But the near-poor (currently the most frequent users of child care arrangements) would remain to be helped. Near-poor families would need subsidies covering 3/4 to 5/6 of child care costs for most such families to be able to use good care. Another sixth of America's children live in near-poor families (above the poverty line but within the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Low Family Budget" definition). Not to help such families would seem a serious injustice.

It is, incidentally, difficult to see how the presently proposed $1-2 billion can adequately help more than one or at the most two million children--and there are nearly seven million children in poor families under the age of six, not to mention near-poor families and after-school children.

1/ Calculated from the Westat Survey, op. cit., Tables 2.63 and 2.64, pp. 92-93.

- The Federal Government could plan expansion of child care at present salaries (the median is $4,300 per year for staff and directors, according to the Westat Survey). It is, however, not certain that staff will long be available at such salaries; directors are already difficult to recruit. Moreover, with increasing unionization of child care workers, the more frequent hiring of men, equal pay for women, and steady improvements in certification and training of child care teachers, it seems likely that salaries will rise. And it seems paradoxical to plan to extend child care at salaries of $300-400 a month when one purpose of child care is to help families beyond the poverty level.

- The Federal Government could plan to extend child care with minimally acceptable staff-child ratios and/or restricted scope of program. Programs of this kind meeting proposed Federal Inter-Agency Requirements, and paying teacher salaries of $4,500 to $7,500, would cost perhaps $1,300-1,700 a year per child. They would only loosely resemble the "desirable," "developmental" care described earlier and would still be quite expensive for a broad Federal program.

- The Federal Government could decide to continue the present, multiple-source funding pattern of formal child care programs. Federal, state and local governments might subsidize some start-up costs and continue to pay about 50% of recurrent costs. In order to encourage continued, in-kind resource recruitment, programs should be located in or near high schools, old age homes, VA hospitals and other groups and institutions engaged in training and rehabilitation, or otherwise a source of volunteers. The Federal Government could require that the total of public money used for recurrent costs be matched by in-kind resources and volunteers, subsidies from private and community organizations and parent fees.

This plan would put a heavy burden on the poorest areas, and Congress might decide to increase the proportion of recurrent costs paid by public funds for poverty children. This could be done by declaring a voucher worth $1,500 a year for children from poverty families, and $1,000 a year for the near-poor; all programs would still be required to offer matching resources to provide care worth $2,000 per child-year. Or Congress might set up vendor repayment schemes administered regionally, requiring 1:1 matching in most areas but two Federal dollars for every local dollar's worth of resources in poverty areas.

Such a plan would have the advantage of encouraging good care with government subsidies at a lower average cost per year: say $1,000 - $1,500 instead of $2,000. And this plan would continue a present pattern.

Such schemes have two disadvantages. Local governments and agencies do not like matching-grant subsidies because Federal subsidies sometimes disappear leaving local agencies to support the program. And it can be difficult to enforce matching where in-kind resources are part of what is offered as matched "funds." Congress should consider requiring that half

of Federal funds for recurrent costs be used for supplementary programs, and for standard-core services not directly concerned with classroom teaching: staff training, child evaluation, "standard" parent counseling, medical care, etc. This would mean in practice, paying the director's salary, and salaries of special personnel, medicines, etc. In the event of a cut in funding, the basic teaching program would already be locally supported, and a good director would already have been recruited. Moreover, requiring matched resources to be of a certain kind and number (e.g., enough teachers for a given ratio) means that Congress could more easily guarantee compliance. (If the Federal Government supplied funds to pay directors, special personnel, etc., requiring local "matching" in the form of a certain number of teachers,it would be clear whether or not the local contribution was sufficient.)

- Finally the Federal Government should consider possible gains in efficiency of service. It was noted above that large centers may be slightly less expensive but may in general offer lower "quality" care and cannot therefore be considered more efficient.

There are, however, two likely areas for cost reduction. Start-up efforts are presently enormously costly, in time and money. Gilbert Steiner estimated 43% of appropriated child care funds used in licensing in FY 1965.1/ In Massachusetts and many other states, it takes program directors months and years to get information from multiple State and Federal agencies, and get licensed. An assault on start-up problems will clearly save enormous effort and expense.

Secondly, as noted above, mixed home-care-center-care systems may offer certain cost savings. In various cities such programs are struggling to be born; fostering and evaluating such programs would seem to be of high priority.

In the last analysis Federal policy will be made according to a system of priorities. Children have no powerful lobby; poor parents often feel they can only vote with their feet--trying to avoid poor child care which does not really meet their needs, trying to seek warm, responsive care that is as good as a good home. But one-third of the nation's children now live in poor and near-poor families. Their present lives need support and encouragement. Their future lives will inescapably affect those of us who are presently adult. Today you have a chance to make a difference in the lives of children; tomorrow they will have the chance to make a difference in our lives. How will we plan for children--the nation's chief resource?

1/ Gilbert Steiner, The State of Welfare, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., 1971, p. 61.

THE CHILD CARE BULLETIN SERIES

No. 1, Subject: *Day Care: Resources For Decisions* Winter, 1971-72 ($.50)
Two excerpts from a compendium of articles edited by Edith H. Grotberg, Ph.D. on the state of the art of day care.

No. 2, Subject: *Feasibility Report and Design of an Impact Study of Day Care* Winter, 1971-72 ($.50)
A précis of the report prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Center for the Study of Public Policy.

No. 3, Subject: *A Study in Child Care 1970-71* Winter, 1971-72 ($.50)
Findings of the three-volume Abt Associate, Inc., survey of thirteen exemplary day care centers and seven exemplary systems.

No. 4, Subject: *A Survey of State Day Care Licensing Requirements* Spring, 1972 ($1.00)
Findings and recommendations of Social and Administrative Services and Systems Association/Consulting Services, Inc., study of state licensing procedures.

No. 5, Subject: *Planning Papers and Evaluation of the Vermont Model Family Assistance Plan (Child Care Component)* Summer, 1972
Excerpts from planning by Mathematica, Inc., and evaluations by Leadership Institute for Community Development of the pretest of child care as part of welfare reform in Vermont.

No. 6, Subject: *Evaluation of a Reading Program of the National Capital Area Child Day Care Association* Spring, 1972 ($.50)
A précis of the methodology and conclusions of a test of a reading readiness program in the context of an established day care center system.

No. 7, Subject: *Day Care Survey 1970* Spring, 1972 ($1.50)
The findings of the Westinghouse Learning Corporation/Westat Research, Inc., a sample survey and national projection of current day care use and need.

No. 8, Subject: *Working Papers of the Workshop on Day Care—Airlie House, Virginia—1970* Summer, 1972
A summary of the variety of conclusions and recommendations emanating from the workshop called by the Office of Child Development/DHEW in July, 1970.

No. 9, Subject: *Child Care Policy Issues* Summer, 1972
A survey of the issues, considered by the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies, which are basic to planning for day care in the United States.

Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
1401 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Subscription to all nine Bulletins $5.00

Reduced rates on bulk orders available upon request. Please add $.50 postage and handling for all orders under $5.00; 10% of total on orders over $5.00.

All orders must be prepaid.

The New Resources Library has complete copies of the studies on which these Bulletins are based. Volumes may be borrowed for the cost of round-trip postage. Detailed Library information is available on request.